

To: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]@gmail.com]
Cc: elaine isely[esisely@wmeac.org]; Leeming, Susan (DEQ)[LeemingS@michigan.gov]; Muniz, Nuria[Muniz.Nuria@epa.gov]; Walczak, Joe (DEQ)[WALCZAKJ@michigan.gov]; [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]@gmail.com; O'Donnell, David (DEQ)[ODONNELLD@michigan.gov]
From: Pawłowski, John (DEQ)
Sent: Thur 7/28/2016 2:14:44 PM
Subject: RE: Oversight Group: Compilation of Questions/Concerns WWW Tannery Site
[www 040911.jpg](#)
[WWW 04142016.jpg](#)

1. [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy] I am confused regarding the covering of the creek. Looking at post demolition and current aerial photos (attached) we do not see where additional concrete has been placed over Rum Creek.
2. To date, WWW has not submitted a Conceptual Site Model. However, we are fairly confident in our understanding of the geology, so a CSM may not be necessary.
3. At this point, the DEQ is satisfied that WWW has adequately addressed contamination concerns in the four source areas. With regards to contaminants of concern potentially discharging to the Rogue River and Rum Creek, we will be reviewing the groundwater data to determine if the extent of contamination has been adequately defined as part of our review of any mixing zone requests submitted by WWW.

From: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 3:50 PM
To: Pawloski, John (DEQ)
Cc: elaine isely; Leeming, Susan (DEQ); muniz.nuria@epamail.epa.gov; Walczak, Joe (DEQ); Nicholas Occhipinti
Subject: Re: Oversight Group: Compilation of Questions/Concerns WWW Tannery Site

Hi John,

I read your response to Elaine Isely regarding the ammonia issues and we appreciate your update. We still have questions, however, regarding other outstanding issues, and I have re-copied them below from my previous e-mail of June 28, 2016. The Oversight group will be meeting next week to discuss these questions. Before we meet, could you provide more information as to how DEQ Remediation is addressing these concerns?

Thank you so much,

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

1. CCRR, as well as Dr. Rediske and WMEAC are concerned and mystified as to why a new portion of Rum Creek, since October of 2015, and on the the tannery site, has now been covered over by a large cement slab. (see photos). When I spoke to you last fall about this, it did not seem that the DEQ was even aware that this work activity had taken place. Was this a permitted work activity, and if it was, on what basis was it approved as being a good thing for the health of Rum Creek?

2. Has a Conceptual Site Model been provided to the DEQ? This conceptual site model was referred to in at least three of the approved work plans.

3. The EPA has tasked the DEQ to oversee Wolverine's further investigation/remediation of **four source areas** as noted in the **2012 CERCLA Report**. Is the DEQ satisfied that Wolverine has adequately addressed contamination concerns in these four source areas? Are all contaminants of concern being taking into account?

- 1. The Pit
- 2. The Waster Water Treatment Plant
- 3. The east bank of the Rogue River adjacent to the site
- 4. The UST Area

Thank you for your time and your willingness to address these concerns.

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy CRR and all the members of the WWW Citizen Oversight Group.

On Tue, Jun 28, 2016 at 9:42 PM, A. J. Birkbeck <ajbirkbeck@fulcrumlaw.com> wrote:

I should have continued to scroll down. Again, excellent.

From: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 9:00 PM

To: Rick Rediske; A. J. Birkbeck

Cc: **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Subject: Fwd: Oversight Group: Compilation of Questions/Concerns WWW Tannery Site

Hi everyone,

Here is what I sent to the DEQ this morning, along with the response from John P and Elaine. Just wanted to keep everyone in the loop. Thank you so much for your continued help and your interest.

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Date: Tue, Jun 28, 2016 at 4:30 PM

Subject: Re: Oversight Group: Compilation of Questions/Concerns WWW Tannery Site

To: **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** <Ex.6-PP@gmail.com>

Thank you for this,

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

I couldn't get an invite to the meeting on the 30th, but Wolverine is willing to meet with me and the City of Rockford afterward. I'm trying to set something up for next week. This will help me prepare.

Elaine

Elaine Sterrett Isely

Water & LID Programs Director

West Michigan Environmental Action Council (WMEAC)

1007 Lake Drive SE

Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Office: 616-451-3051, ext. 25

Cell: 616-490-0456

esisely@wmeac.org

On Tue, Jun 28, 2016 at 8:21 AM, 003 **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** [gmail.com](#)> wrote:

Hi John,

On behalf of CCRR, WMEAC, and other members of our oversight group, we are submitting the following compilation of concerns regarding the dearth of progress at the Wolverine Tannery Site. It has been four years since the CERCLA report was completed and very little new information has been gained regarding the four source areas of concern noted in that report.

1. The Pit
2. The Waster water treatment plant
3. The east bank of the Rogue River adjacent to the site
4. The Ust Area

Now, after reading the most recent 2016 Rose&Westra Report, where WWW appears to be finding every which way to not deal with the very real problems associated with ammonia, we find it important to strongly weigh in.

Attached to this e-mail are the following:

1. Comments from Dr. Rick Rediske of the Annis Water Resources Institute and professor at Grand Valley State University, a man whose credentials could not be higher. These comments are all in relation to the most recent 2016 report. However, he has additional concerns, as we all do, regarding the adequacy of the on-going investigation and remediation of this sight.
2. WMEAC is concerned, as we all are, that new laws proposed in Part 201 legislation, will only

make it easier and more convenient for WWW not to fulfill their obligations to the Clean Water Act or take action to deal with the ammonia problems that continue to erode the water quality of the Rogue River in the Impoundment area.

3. CCRR, as well as Dr. Rediske and WMEAC are concerned and mystified as to why a new portion of Rum Creek, since October of 2015, and on the the tannery site, has now been covered over by a large cement slab. (see photos). When I spoke to you last fall about this, it did not seem that the DEQ was even aware that this work activity had taken place. Was this a permitted work activity, and if it was, on what basis was it approved as being a good thing for the health of Rum Creek?

4. The Oversight group would like to meet with the DEQ soon after your meeting with Wolverine on June 30, 2016. Sometime in early July we would like to discuss in further detail *all* our concerns related to the lack of any significant, targeted progress made in regards to the investigation of environmental problems still associated with this Site.

5. Last question: Has a conceptual site model ever been submitted to the DEQ?

Thank you for your time and your willingness to address these concerns.

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

CCRR and all the members of the WWW Citizen Oversight Group.